

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 are pending. Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 currently stand rejected. No claims have been amended herein. Claims 7 and 17 have been previously canceled. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests allowance of claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Somashekhar (U.S. Patent No. 7,006,536), in view of Maciocco (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0170165). Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,754), in view of Ovadia'544 (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0208544). Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0103926), in view of Ovadia'471 (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0198471). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, in part, to “transfer in parallel over multiple optical wavelengths the first section overhead, the first line overhead, the path overhead, and the user data....” The Office Action admits that Somashekhar fails to disclose a first interface for receiving over a single optical wavelength a SONET signal to transfer in parallel over multiple optical wavelengths a SONET signal, as recited, in part, by claim 1 (Office Action, page 2). The combination of Somashekhar with Maciocco does not overcome the failed teachings of Somashekhar. In contrast to claim 1, Maciocco teaches “optical control bursts and network management control bursts are sent *asynchronously* relative to its corresponding optical data burst signals” (Maciocco, paragraph [0022], lines 25-27, emphasis added) to allow the control and management burst signals to first configure optical switch settings for transferring the optical data burst signals (Maciocco, paragraph [0023]).

Claim 1 also recites receiving the *same* “first section overhead, the first line overhead, the path overhead, and the user data” in the second interface system as transferred by the first interface system. In contrast, Maciocco teaches control burst information is changed by each switching node based on routing information (Maciocco, paragraph [0023], lines 12-15).

Similarly, regarding the rejection of claim 1 over Sugawara in view of Ovadia'544, the Office Action admits that Sugawara fails to disclose a first interface for receiving over a single optical wavelength a SONET signal to transfer in parallel over multiple optical wavelengths a SONET signal, as recited, in part, by claim 1 (Office Action, page 5, lines 9-10). Also, regarding the rejection of claim 1 over Cook in view of Ovadia'471, the Office Action admits that Cook fails to disclose a first interface for receiving over a single optical wavelength a SONET signal to transfer in parallel over multiple optical wavelengths a SONET signal, as recited, in part, by claim 1 (Office Action at page 7, lines 10-12).

Ovadia'544 and Ovadia'471 incorporate similar teachings as Maciocco. (See Ovadia'544, paragraph [0029], lines 19-21 and paragraph [0030], lines 12-16; see also Ovadia'471, paragraph [0018], lines 16-18 and paragraph [0019], lines 11-15.) Thus, the Applicant asserts that the discussion above regarding the rejection of the claims over Somashekhar in view of Maciocco applies as well to the rejection of the claims over Sugawara in view of Ovadia'544, and over Cook in view of Ovadia'471. The rejections should be withdrawn accordingly.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable, and such indication is respectfully requested. Claim 11 contains limitations similar to claim 1 and is therefore respectfully asserted to be allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 1.

While separately allowable over the art of record, dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-16, and 18-20 depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the rejection of claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for the sake of brevity.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 210765, accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/David J. Bovitz/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

David J. Bovitz, Reg. No. 61,911

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

E-mail: dave@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Steven J. Funk

Sprint

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100